DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 510 CS 504 643

AUTHOR Dorr, Aimee; And Others
TITLE Televised Television Literacy.
PUB DATE Oct 83
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (34th, San Francisco, CA, May 24-28, 1984). The evaluation reported in this paper was supported by a grant from NBC.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Change; Broadcast Industry; *Childhood Attitudes; Elementary Education; Mass Media Effects; *Programing (Broadcast); Recall (Psychology); *Television Research; *Television Viewing; *Visual Literacy

ABSTRACT

Ninety-four children, aged 5 to 12 years, were subjects of a study of recall of television literacy messages (drop-ins). The 30-second "How To Watch TV" (HTWTV) segments were designed for broadcast on Saturday mornings by the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) to convey to children some information and values about television (e.g., animals do not really die in television filming). On the first two days of the study, children viewed two different episodes of a half-hour prosocial children's program, with two different HTWTV "drop-ins." On the third day, they viewed a different program, with no drop-ins. Questionnaires and interviews were completed on the fourth day, when no viewing occurred, and on the fifth day, immediately after viewing a final episode of the first program, with another drop-in. The results indicated that the HTWTV drop-ins were clearly a positive contribution to children's television viewing experience. Slightly more than 80% of the children tested were aware of having seen one or more drop-ins, and nearly two-thirds of those were able to recall correct information from a drop-in and to recognize from among three alternatives a summary of the main point. Results suggest that the television industry itself can develop and distribute television literacy materials. (Tables of findings are appended.) (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED246510

Televised Television Literacy

Aimee Dorr
School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024
(213) 825-1838

Catherine Doubleday
School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024
(213) 825-8353

Peter Kovaric
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90089-0281
(213) 743-6273

Dale Kunkel
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90089-0281
(213) 743-6273

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Aimee Dorr
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

October 1983

The evaluation reported in this paper was supported by a grant from NBC. The opinions presented are those of the authors and not necessarily those of NBC.

CS504643

ABSTRACT

The value of young children's development of an understanding of TV as a medium, commonly referred to as TV literacy, is increasingly being recognized. While many TV literacy curricula have been developed, none have been produced by or broadcast over network television. However, NBC recently developed and aired a series of short segments designed to convey to children some information and values about television. This study presents an evaluation of children's recall and understanding of these messages. Results suggest that the television segments do have an impact, but that some of the messages contained in them are considerably more successful than others. Potential reasons for these differences are explored.

Given television's well established position as an integral and ubiquitous aspect of American culture and its demonstrated influence on children, the public and professional interest in having the medium serve good purposes is understandable. Recently, much of this interest has been directed toward the development and promotion of television literacy curricula for children, adolescents, and/or their parents (see Anderson, 1980; Corder-Bolz, 1982; Dorr, in press; Ploghoft & Anderson, 1981; Searching, 1980 for reviews). These curricula, although about television, have not been produced by the television industry nor distributed by it. Many argue they should be for the following reasons. The programs and commercials the television industry broadcasts have created the need for the development of television literacy curricula; broadcasting over television is the surest way to reach people who could benefit from the curricula; the broadcasters owe something to those on whose viewing they depend in order to turn a profit. In 1978 NBC took the first steps toward direct broadcast industry participation in developing and airing TV literacy information. A small number of short segments designed to inform children about some aspects of television were created by NBC and broadcast on Saturday mornings. In this paper we report the findings from an evaluation on these segments, known collectively as How to Watch TV (HTWTV).

Television literacy curricula have various ultimate goals: that children will watch less television, that they will watch better television, that they will believe or be influenced by less of what they see, and/or that they will be less influenced by the "bad" things they see on television. Attaining these goals is usually thought to come about by making children aware of their viewing practices, teaching them how and why programs are produced and broadcast, and/or helping them to be more analytical and evaluative about program and commercial content (for examples of curricula see Corder-Bolz, 1980; DeFranco, 1980; Dorr, Graves, & Phelps, 1980; Feshbach, Feshbach, & Cohen, 1982; Kaye, 1979; Logan & Moody, 1979; Lloyd-Kolkin, Wheeler, & Strand, 1980; Roberts, Christenson, Gibson, Mooser, & Goldberg, 1980; Singer, Zuckerman, & Singer, 1980; WNET, 1979). The NBC segments only sought to inform children about some of the illusions that can be created by television, to explain why commercials are broadcast, and to advocate certain desirable practices vis-a-vis television viewing patterns and responses to commercials. They were, then, a very limited curriculum, if a curriculum at all, with limited goals.

The HTWTV segments were designed to be inserted into the Saturday morning schedule in the same way that commercials are. Each was therefore self-contained and addressed one idea. At the network they were known as HTWTV drop-ins. The idea for the project and for several of the specific drop-ins came from interviews NBC staff had conducted with child development and television scholars in 1978-79. There was no attempt, however, to produce a comprehensive curriculum or to establish any concrete goals other than conveying several different pieces of information about television to children. The message of each drop-in was chosen because it seemed important for children to know, unlikely that most 6-11 year olds already knew it, and amenable to realization in a very short television segment. In general, NBC staff chose the messages that were then translated into drop-ins by an independent production

group and broadcast Saturday mornings during the 1979-80 and 1980-81 seasons.

Each drop-in was about 30 seconds long and usually featured a live male actor who was the lead in a half-hour "prosocial" children's program NBC also broadcast during the 1980-81 season. As much as possible, the message of the drop-in was acted out. It was also stated. Each drop-in ended with a visual and audio presentation saying "There's a smart way to watch TV." An example of a drop-in with a strong visual representation is "Animals Don't Die." It begins with a man in a Canadian Mountie uniform lamenting the imminent death of his huskie in the swirling snow. As the dog "dies," the Mountie says animals don't really die on television and the camera pulls back to show the set and the dog's trainer. On command the dog jumps up and goes to the Mountie for a pat. The drop-in ends with the visual and audio "There's a smart way to watch TV." The structure of other drop-ins was the same, although they varied considerably in how much the message was conveyed visually as well as verbally. In general, two drop-ins were broadcast between 8AM and noon each Saturday.

There was some uncertainty about how best to evaluate these drop-ins. They were few in number and short in length. They did not constitute a full curriculum, nor were they produced to meet a series of specific goals. They were being broadcast each Saturday during the period the evaluation was to be done, and they had been broadcast the entire preceding year. They were normally viewed by children in the context of voluntary viewing at home with programs, commercials, program promotions, and separators also broadcast at nearly the same time. The interest was in whether under normal viewing conditions children would remember, understand, or in any way take seriously the HTWTV drop-ins. In general, television literacy curricula have not been rigorously evaluated (Dorr, in press). Only one curriculum has been evaluated for achieving its ultimate goals and the results there were not particularly encouraging (Dorr et al., 1980). For several curricula, however, it has been demonstrated that children learned about the television medium and its content, structure, and function (Corder-Bolz, 1980; Dorr et al., 1980; Feshbach et al., 1982; Roberts et al., 1980; Singer et al., 1980). The relationship of such knowledge to attaining the ultimate goals of a curriculum is an open question. Given these several factors, a non-experimental approach was chosen to explore what children remembered about and thought of the HTWTV drop-ins.

The primary goal of the evaluation was to determine whether children remembered and understood HTWTV drop-ins when they were shown as part of an ordinary broadcast schedule format. This was assessed in several ways, including children's simple affirmations that they had seen HTWTV drop-ins, their descriptions of the content of HTWTV drop-ins, and their ability to select the correct message of a drop-in from among several choices. We also wanted to know how much children felt the HTWTV drop-ins conveyed information they did not already know, told them things they were curious about, and focussed on messages worth learning.

In addition to these issues about the impact of the messages and children's judgments of their worth, it also seemed important to assess children's opinions about what type of content the drop-ins were and

what type of television content the ideas applied to. Because the drop-ins are short like ads and humorous like entertainment, and because most youngsters do not yet hold the concept of public service announcements, children are likely to have a variety of concepts about what type of content the HTWTV drop-ins are. These concepts may influence how children respond to them. For instance, if they believe they are commercials, viewers may take them less seriously than if they believe they are in some way instructional. Children also may not be entirely certain whether the messages of the HTWTV drop-ins apply only to Saturday morning programming, the only time they were broadcast, or to all television programming. The potential impact of the drop-ins should be greater if children recognize that their messages apply to all programming, not just to Saturday morning children's television.

All these issues about impact of the HTWTV drop-ins and about children's interpretation of them are addressed in this study.

METHOD

Sample

Ninety-four children participated in the study. Their ages ranged from 5 to 12 years, with a mean of 7.8 years. The sample was about evenly divided by sex, with 45 boys and 49 girls. It was also ethnically mixed. As determined solely by appearance and name, which obviously are imprecise indicators, the sample was 60% white, 32% black, 4% Asian, 3% Hispanic, and 1% other. The children were drawn from five afterschool childcare programs scattered around the metropolitan Los Angeles area. All programs were ethnically mixed. Two serviced primarily middle-class families; one, primarily lower- and lower-middle-class families; and the remaining, two families of mixed social class backgrounds. Each program received a monetary gift for participating. Parents had given informed consent for their children's participation prior to any research contact with the children, and children gave their consent immediately before the first testing session. At the time of the data analysis, children were divided into groups of younger (mean = 6.3 years, range = 5-7) and older (mean = 9.3 years, range = 8-12) children. These groups were each made up of about equal numbers of boys and girls.

Procedure

The study spanned five days at each of the participating childcare programs, requiring 30-60 minutes each day. On each of the first three days, children gathered together and viewed a half-hour prosocial children's program. On days 1 and 2, the children viewed two different episodes of Drawing Power (a regularly scheduled NBC Saturday morning program), each with a different HTWTV drop-in. On day 3, an episode of The New Fat Albert Show (a regularly scheduled CBS Saturday morning program) without such a drop-in was viewed. Data were then collected from the children by questionnaires and interviews completed on day 4, when no viewing occurred, and on day 5, immediately after viewing a final episode of Drawing Power that included another HTWTV drop-in. On both day 4 and day 5 children were questioned about both Drawing Power and the HTWTV drop-ins. Only the findings related to the drop-ins will be reported here. As one

would expect in a project involving multiple contacts, several children did not attend their childcare program at all contact points, resulting in varying numbers of children for different analyses (all less than the total N of 94). So far as we could tell subject loss was not associated with sex, age, ethnicity, or childcare program.

Four HTWTV drop-ins were used. One was inserted in each of four different episodes of Drawing Power. Both the episodes used and their order of viewing were rotated across the five afterschool programs. The four episodes of Drawing Power and the one of The New Fat Albert Show were all taped off the air. They included animated stories, live action segments, commercials, program promotions, drop-ins, and separators between program content and all other material. They were shown to children without any editing, using a videocassette recorder and color monitor that researchers brought to the childcare program. Children were asked to gather round the monitor in a fairly informal setting in which they were nonetheless expected to remain until the program was over.

On testing days, a group of four to eight male and female anglo researchers went to the childcare program. Each researcher administered questionnaires to groups of two to four children, with younger children in smaller groups than older children. Children were seated at tables and were separated by space sufficient to minimize influencing each other. Items were read aloud by the researchers who also demonstrated, as necessary, where to mark answers on the response sheet. Researchers monitored children's responses closely to be sure they were correctly entered on the response sheets. Whenever there was any question about a child's response, the researcher stopped to clarify it. Occasionally younger children had to be helped to keep their responses on the right line. Otherwise, children had little difficulty selecting and entering their opinions on response sheets that required them to circle words such as "yes" and "no," letters representing up to four multiple choice responses, or facial expressions representing degrees of liking and disliking. On day 4, after the questionnaires were completed children were individually interviewed about the HTWTV drop-ins to assess recall. On day 5, all HTWTV data were gathered by questionnaire.

RESULTS

The findings about the impact of the HTWTV drop-ins are presented in four sections. First, findings about children's recognition that they had seen the drop-ins and their recall of the content are discussed. Second, findings are presented about children's ability to recognize the main points of the four HTWTV drop-ins tested. Third, findings are presented about children's judgments as to whether they already knew the information the drop-ins presented, were curious about it, and considered it worthwhile. Finally, children's judgments about what kind of content the drop-ins were and the type of programming to which their information applied are summarized.

Recall

Children were twice asked if they recalled having seen something on television about "how to watch TV" or a "smart way to watch TV." The first time they had been exposed to two drop-ins as part of viewing Drawing Power episodes, two to six days prior to testing. The second time they had been exposed to one drop-in in another Drawing Power episode shown the same day the testing was done. Children also could have seen such drop-ins at some time during their at-home viewing of NBC Saturday morning programming over the preceding two years. Based on television viewing related to this project, we expected that more children should report having seen the drop-ins when they were tested soon after viewing one than when they were tested several days after viewing one.

Insert Table 1 about here

As shown in Table 1, the majority of children of each sex and age group believed they had recently seen something about how to watch television. In general, older children were somewhat more likely than younger children to say they had seen some such content, and boys were much more likely than girls to say they had seen it. Overall there is a slight increase, from 82% to 86%, in the number of children saying they had seen such content when they were asked right after viewing the drop-ins rather than several days after viewing them. Among younger children, the increase in reported viewing is much greater when questioning was closer in time to viewing, 74% to 88%, whereas among older children there is actually a slight decrease (90% to 84%).

To assess how much children who said they had seen something about how to watch television actually had appropriate content in mind when they answered the question, all those who said they had seen such programming were questioned about its content. Those questioned immediately after viewing or day 5 were given a multiple choice recognition test about the message of the drop-in they had just seen. These results will be reported in the next section. In the remainder of this section we concentrate on the responses of children interviewed on day 4. These children were individually asked if they recalled ever having seen anything about how to watch television and, if so, what it was like. Thus their responses could include content they had seen in the childcare program or at home, HTWTV drop-ins or other similar content. During the interview they were never reminded of the viewing they had recently done at the childcare program.

As is often the case for both children and adults, many children who claimed to have seen programming about how to watch television could not describe any of it to the researchers (see Table 1). Only 62% of those who claimed to have seen such programming could actually describe any of the HTWTV content. Given that the children had all just seen at least one drop-in over the past few days, this lack of recall is notable. In general, older children who said they had seen such content were more

likely to recall some of it than were younger children. Older girls recalled more than older boys.

The ideas which children recalled were examined to see what they were and how they varied by the age and sex of the children recalling them (see Table 2). The number of ideas recalled by individual children ranged from 0-4, with the mean at 1.2. Of these, a smaller number was judged to be correct ideas from the HTWTV drop-ins (x=0.8). Older children were likely to give more ideas and more correct ideas than were younger children, and girls were likely to do both more than boys.

Insert Table 2 about here

Children offered ideas from nine HTWTV drop-ins, even though the total group had only been exposed to four, and no child had seen more than three of these four as part of the evaluation procedures (see Table 3). The two most frequently recalled drop-ins had both been recently viewed by the children in the project. However, one drop-in that children had viewed as part of the treatment was never mentioned by any children (Why Ads Are on TV). A measure of the "staying power" of the drop-ins is that five were mentioned that could only have been seen by children during their normal home viewing. It is impressive that many such short segments broadcast as part of a very full Saturday morning format were still remembered by the children. It is also notable that twelve children remembered the common slogan of the drop-ins, "There's a smart way to watch TV."

Insert Table 3 about here

Recognition of Main Points

Children's ability to recognize the main point of a drop-in was assessed on day 5 by questioning children who had just seen a program which included one of the HTWTV drop-ins. All those who said they remembered having just seen something about how to watch television were asked to select the correct description of the main point of that drop-in from among three possibilities. Each child was asked about the one drop-in of four that he or she had just seen. Recognition scores for each age and sex group are then aggregates for four different HTWTV drop-ins.

As shown in Table 4, 61% of the children correctly selected the appropriate main idea from among three alternatives. Many more older than younger children and more girls than boys were able to select the correct alternative. Younger boys performed no better than chance on this item, and older boys performed only about as well as younger girls.

This suggests, as did the data on number of ideas and number of correct ideas recalled (see Table 2), that the ideas behind the HTWTV messages were not communicated very effectively to boys, especially younger boys.

Insert Table 4 about here

Examination of the recognition scores for the four drop-ins tested shows that the one about animals not dying on television programs was better understood than the other three (see Table 4). It is possible that this result is due to the fact that most children already knew that animals do not really die on television while fewer knew the main ideas in the other three drop-ins. However, the data do not bear this out. For each HTWTV drop-in, roughly the same percentage of children said they already knew the idea it presented. Naturally, not all the children who said they already knew the idea correctly identified it in the recognition test. But the proportions of children making this error were about the same across all four drop-ins. We will reserve other conjecture about more likely causes for the differences in drop-ins' recognition scores for the discussion section.

Evaluation of Messages

A third aspect of the study was an assessment of the worth of the HTWTV drop-ins from the children's point of view. Children were asked by questionnaire on day 5 whether the drop-in they had just viewed presented a new idea, and if so, if they had ever wondered about it. Children were also asked if they thought the idea was worth presenting on television.

As shown in Table 5, 64% of the children believed that they already knew the information in the drop-in they had just viewed. Older more than younger children and girls more than boys were likely to feel they already knew it. There was no indication that any particular drop-in was more or less likely to have been known already, either by all children combined or by children divided by age and sex. Many believed they learned something new from the HTWTV drop-ins.

Insert Table 5 about here

Overall, 54% of the children who said they did not already know a drop-in's information indicated that they had wondered about it. Also, 81% of all children felt that the drop-ins' information was worth knowing (see Table 5). Taken as a whole, these data indicate that 5-12 year old children find the ideas presented in the HTWTV drop-ins interesting and judge them to be worth knowing.

Application of Messages.

The HTWTV drop-ins were produced to teach children about television. With this as their goal, it was important that children not dismiss them as simple entertainment or advertising. Yet it is possible that children might view them as either entertainment programming or commercial advertising. Characteristics that would make them seem like commercials are that they are short like commercials and inserted during commercial breaks. Characteristics that would make them seem like entertainment programming are that they feature one of the main characters of Drawing Power, a regular NBC Saturday morning program, and that they occur back-to-back with entertainment programming (at the beginning or end of commercial breaks). Moreover, they do not obviously hawk a product. With these factors in mind, all children were asked a multiple choice question about what the HTWTV drop-ins were--ads, part of the program, or something else. Data presented in Table 6 show that 51% of the children categorized drop-ins as commercial advertising. The remaining chidren were about evenly split between believing they were part of the program and something else. There were no consistent differences by age or sex in these beliefs. This finding suggests that some children, believing the HTWTV drop-ins are like commercials, may grant them less credibility than they would if they understood their true intent.

Insert Table 6 about here

A second aspect of successfully teaching children about television is having them understand that the messages of the HTWTV drop-ins apply to all television programming, not just to programming broadcast Saturday morning when the drop-ins were broadcast. To assess the extent to which children understood this, they were asked whether the idea in the drop-in they had just seen was true for all television programming or just for Saturday morning programming. The majority of the children (74%) understood the HTWTV ideas applied to all programming (see Table 6). At the same time, it should be noted that the younger children's responses are not that much above guessing probability. Older children were more likely to understand that the ideas applied to all programming, and girls were more likely than boys to understand that.

DISCUSSION

The HTWTV drop-ins were clearly a positive contribution to children's television viewing experiences. They presented information children judged to be worthwhile, whether or not they believed they already knew it, and adults certainly judged the information to be beneficial for children. Slightly more than 80% of the children tested were aware of having seen one or more drop-ins, whether they were tested right after viewing or several days later. Moreover, nearly two-thirds of these children were able to recall correct information from a drop-in and to recognize from among three alternatives a summary of the main point of a drop-in they had just seen as part of a regular Saturday morning half-

hour broadcast. Especially noteworthy is the fact that 21 children also correctly recalled ideas from other HTWTV drop-ins that they could only have seen during their home viewing the year of the evaluation or the preceding year.

How much should be made of these findings? It depends, of course, on the standards one uses. Two conventional standard are comparisons with control groups of one sort or another and pre-post comparisons. Neither standard is available for use in this study. Several factors mitigated against adopting either of these approaches. The drop-ins had been and were being broadcast every Saturday morning, they were inserted into a very busy schedule, they were few in number and short in length, they did not constitute a full curriculum, and NBC wanted as much information as possible specifically about children's reactions to the drop-ins themselves. The data on children's recall of ideas from HTWTV drop-ins other than those shown to them as part of the study confirmed our initial belief that no "untreated" control group or pretest was possible. Nonetheless, a more rigorous scientific test of the efficacy of the HTWTV drop-ins is certainly called for. Such a test would use either or both a standard control group and pre-post tests. It would also look beyond reception and evaluation of the HTWTV drop-ins to assess generalization and application of their messages.

A more rigorous test of the HTWTV drop-ins seems particularly desirable because the present study suggests that they have some impact on child viewers. Like more formal and complete television literacy curricula, the drop-ins conveyed information and values about television that adults believe should help children to gain more and lose less from television viewing. Although the design of the present study is not particularly strong methodologically, there are many TV literacy curricula in use today that have been even less stringently evaluated. Many curricula and the drop-ins clearly would benefit from more formal evaluations so that we can more accurately assess the extent to which children can be helped to become better viewers and how best to achieve this goal.

There was some variability in the effectiveness of the four drop-ins shown to children for this study, variability that suggests some types of drop-ins will achieve their goals better than others. In our data one drop-in, "Animals Don't Die," stood out in that many more children understood it than understood any of the other three drop-ins. As we've already described, the main idea of this drop-in was concretely, visually presented. The other three drop-ins (Why Ads Are on TV, Planning Time for TV and Other Activities, and It's a Good Idea to Have Different Types of People on TV) all conveyed more abstract concepts, and none of their presentations was visually concrete. Although the data from this study do not allow one to be certain which characteristics account for differences in message effectiveness, it seems likely that explicit visual presentation of the main idea is an important factor in young children's recall and understanding of the drop-ins. This position is also supported by the fact that most of the HTWTV drop-ins recalled from children's home viewing were also oriented toward concrete visual presentations. For instance, fist fights were shown so that the viewer would see both how real they looked and how they were faked. When

children were asked to describe what they had seen about how to watch television, these were more visually explicit drop-ins were more frequently recalled and better understood than were the other drop-ins, particularly the two included in the treatment viewings (Different People and Why Ads Are on TV) that were not visually explicit.

The findings of this study and general principles of communication, especially with younger children, would lead one to recommend producing drop-ins that were visually concrete and explicit. A further reason for adopting this approach is the environment in which the drop-ins were broadcast. As we have already described, the Saturday morning time period is very busy with numerous types of content. The drop-ins themselves are very short and were broadcast only twice each Saturday at times no child could predict in advance. Thus, they would be very easy to miss, especially if they were not visually interesting. Moreover, they were broadcast at a time when commericals were also broadcast, and children seemed to be quite confused about whether the drop-ins might not also be commercials. Over half the children believed the drop-ins were like commercial advertisements, and the remaining children were split between believing they were like programming and like something else. There is a possibility, then, that many children would grant the drop-ins less credibility than they would if they understood the drop-ins were intended to inform children accurately about smart ways to watch television.

In sum, the present study suggests that the television industry itself can develop and distribute television literacy materials that reach children and convey some useful information and values to them. NBC is to be applauded for having taken a small step in this direction and also criticized for not having gone further and not persisting longer. A new generation of children comes to television each year in need of education about the medium. The medium itself is the surest way to reach them and potentially the way with the greatest impact. It is to be hoped that in the future we will see both more television literacy materials produced and distributed by those who reach the largest audience of children and more and better evaluations of all available television literacy curricula.

References

Anderson, J. A. The theoretical lineage of critical viewing curricula. Journal of Communication, 1980, 30(3), 64-70.

Corder-Bolz, C. R. Mediation: The role of significant others. Journal of Communication, 1980, 30(3), 106-118.

Corder-Bolz, C. R. Television literacy and critical television viewing skills. In D. Pearl, L. Bouthilet, & J. Lazar (Eds.), Television and behavior: Ten years of scientific progress and implications for the eighties. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health, 1982.

De Franco, E. B. TV on/off. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear, 1980.

Dorr, A. Television viewing programs. In T. Husen & N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), International encyclopedia of education: Research and studies. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press, in press.

Dorr, A., Graves, S. B., & Phelps, E. Television literacy for young children. Journal of Communication, 1980, 30(3), 71-83.

Feshbach, S., Feshbach, N. D., & Cohen, S. E. Enhancing children's discrimination in response to television advertising: The effects of psychoeducational training in two elementary school-age groups. Development Review, 1982, 2, 385-403.

Kaye, E. The ACT guide to children's television or.....how to treat TV with T.L.C. Boston: Beacon, 1979.

Lloyd-Kolkin, D., Wheeler, P., & Strand, T. Developing a curriculum for teenagers. Journal of Communication, 1980, 30(3), 119-125.

Logan, B., & Moody, K. (Eds.). Television awareness training: The viewer's guide for family and community. New York: Media Action Research Center, 1979.

Ploghoft, M. E., & Anderson, J. A. (Eds.). Education for the televison age. Athens, OH: Cooperative Center for Social Science Education, Ohio University, 1981.

Roberts, D. F., Christenson, P., Gibson, W. A., Mooser, L., & Goldberg, M. E. Developing discriminating consumers. Journal of Communication, 1980, 30(3), 94-105.

Searching for alternatives: Critical TV viewing. Journal of Communication, 1980, 30(3), 64-125.

Singer, D. G., Zuckerman, D. M., & Singer, J. L. Helping elementary school children learn about TV. Journal of Communication, 1980, 30(3), 84-93.

WNET/Thirteen Education Department. The television criti-kit: Teacher's guide. New York: WNET, 1979.

Table 1

Children's Reports That They Remember Seeing HTWTV Drop-Ins

	Younger		Older		All
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Children
Children Tested Right After Viewing					
Total N	20	21	22	19	83
# saying they'd seen something	16	21	16	18	71
% saying	80%	95%	73%	95%	86%
Children Tested 2-6 Days After Viewing					
Total N	17	21	22	19	79
# saying they'd seen something	11	17	19	18	65
% saying	65%	81%	86%	95%	82%
# asked to describe what was seen	11	16	19	18	64
# correctly describing what was seen	5	8	16	11	40
% describing	45%	50%	84%	61%	62%

Table 2

Number and Correctness of Ideas Children Recalled About How to Watch TV

	Younger		Older		All
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Children
Mean number of ideas recalled	1.3	0.9	1.6	1.0	1.2
Range	0-3	0-2	0-4	0-3	0-4
Mean number of correct ideas recalled	0.6	0.4	1.4	0.7	0.8
Range	0-2	0-2	0-3	0-3	0-3
(N)	(16)	(21)	(20)	(19)	(76)

Table 3

Children's Recall of Ideas From Specific How to Watch TV Drop-Ins

Drop-Ins Shown for Evaluation	Number of Correct Ideas Recalled	Number of Incomplete or Incorrect Ideas Recalled
Animals don't really die in television programs	9	2
Plan your time so that chores and schoolwork and TV viewing can all be done	9	2
It's good to have different kinds of people on TV	1	4
Ads are shown on TV to tell about products	0	0
Other Drop-Ins Produced for 1980-81 Season		
People like Superman can't really fly	2	0
Drop-Ins Produced for 1979-80 Season		
Before buying the toy just advertised think if you really need it	6	1
People can only go through walls when it's a cartoon	5	1
Apparent falls from high places are stunts requiring jumps	4	1
Fist fights on television are faked	3	0
Characters in television programs do not live there but have their own homes and families	1	0
All Drop-Ins		
General message that there's a smart way to watch TV	12	0

Table 4

Children's Understanding of Messages of How to Watch TV Drop-Ins

	Younger		Older		All
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Children
% children correctly identifying message (all 4 drop-ins combined)	69%	33%	80%	63%	61%
(N)	(16)	(21)	(20)	(19)	(76)

	Animals	Why Ads	Plan Time	Different People
% children correctly identifying message for each drop-in	83%	60%	58%	52%
% children stating they already knew message for each drop-in tested	67%	65%	68%	60%
(N)	(12)	(20)	(19)	(25)

Table 5

Children's Opinions of Novelty and Worth of Messages of How to Watch TV Drop-Ins

	Younger		Older		All
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Children
% children who said already knew message	62%	52%	75%	68%	64%
(N)	(16)	(21)	(20)	(19)	(76)
% children wondering about message when didn't already know it	71%	40%	20%	83%	54%
(N)	(7)	(10)	(5)	(6)	(28)
% children saying message worth knowing	87%	76%	80%	84%	81%
(N)	(15)	(21)	(20)	(19)	(75)

Table 6

Children's Understanding of the Nature of How to Watch TV Drop-ins

% Children Saying How to Watch TV Is:	Younger Girls	Younger Boys	Older Girls	Older Boys	All Children
Ad	50%	57%	60%	37%	51%
Part of Program	25%	14%	25%	37%	25%
Something else	25%	29%	15%	26%	24%
% Children Saying How to Watch TV Applies To:					
All TV programming	69%	62%	90%	74%	74%
Saturday morning programming only	31%	38%	10%	26%	26%
(N)	(16)	(21)	(20)	(19)	(76)